



ADDITIONAL / TO FOLLOW AGENDA ITEMS

This is a supplement to the original agenda and includes reports that are additional to the original agenda or which were marked 'to follow'.

NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: Wednesday, 21 September 2016

Time: 2.30 pm

Place: Ground Floor Committee Room - Loxley House, Station Street, Nottingham, NG2 3NG

Governance Officer: Catherine Ziane-Pryor **Direct Dial:** 0115 8764298

AGENDA

Pages

6 UPDATE

3 - 10

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING COMMITTEE

UPDATE SHEET

(List of additional information, amendments and changes to items since publication of the agenda)

21 September 2016

4a Nottingham Castle HLF scheme

(i) As referred to in the committee report recommendation the Archaeological Mitigation Strategy has now been submitted.

(ii) Comments from Councillor Edwards:

I have attended 2 accompanied briefings and the accompanied tour of the grounds.

I note the restriction in space for a visitors' centre and the challenges of keeping gradients sufficiently gentle once through the Gatehouse, for the benefit of the less mobile and their companions. Hence the requirement to lose a tree because of its level, and because of its location within the proposed centre, and a second tree because of its level, and arguably because of its location within the proposed space for drinking and eating. I do support the development over the loss of the 2 trees in this proposal.

I am concerned that the idea of seeking to reduce the impact of the centre on the visual amenity whilst looking into the castle grounds, or looking back towards the Gatehouse, by making it plain and simple, may not work, and that the proposed building will be unduly unattractive.

Whilst I don't recall the proposal being in the planning application, the decorated hard-standing in front of the Gatehouse is a very important utility and any lawn, or low-walled lawn, in this location would be harder to maintain and would not improve the visual amenity.

Comments:

- 1. *The Archaeological Mitigation Strategy has been agreed by both the City Council's Archaeologist and Historic England and this issue is now addressed.***
- 2. *Noted. This matter is considered in the report.***

(Additional background papers:

1. Archaeological Mitigation Strategy 21.09.16
2. Comments from Cllr Edwards 16.09.16)

4c Lace Market Self-Serve, London Road

(i) Comments of the Design Review Panel in December 2015 and March 2016

Pre-application discussions regarding this site began in September 2015 and the scheme was presented to the Design Review Panel on 10th December. This was at an early stage of design development with a client brief to deliver a larger number of units (100), and considered a range of options that had greater height to the centre and western side of the site.

The Panel welcomed the applicant's commitment to bring forward the regeneration of this longstanding development site, with a good understanding of the site's context and relation to its surroundings evidenced. However, they felt that the scheme did not make a positive contribution to the Lace Market Cliff, and failed to protect or enhance the Lace Market Conservation Area. They concluded that the quantum of development was too high and that there needed to be a reduction in scale and mass.

Discussion was particularly drawn to the proposed tower block element of the scheme and whether a landmark building was needed in this location. The Panel's opinion was that St Mary's Church forms the landmark to the cliff, and so therefore the tallest element should respect the height of the Church. This was not however saying that the placing of height at the end of the cliff could not be looked at in a way to terminate the cascading effect of development along the cliff, but needed to be done in a way which does not draw attention away from the prominence of St Mary's Church.

In March 2016 a revised scheme, on which the current application is based, was presented to a meeting of the Chairs of the Design Review Panel and the Heritage Panel. A Historic England representative was also present. It was agreed that the design of the scheme had moved on since the DRP in December, that the configuration of the proposal was better and the shift of height to the east was seen as a big step forward. The use of different materials in the tower and other buildings was also considered to be appropriate. There were some reservations regarding the quantum and height of the development, though it was concluded that this may be justified with thorough consideration on the impact on views/vistas, which also needed to be evidenced. *The scheme has seen further amendment and refinement since then.*

(ii) Copy of e-mail sent to Planning Committee members from the Civic Society - 15th September 2016

The Civic Society has provided a copy of the e-mail sent to all members of the Planning Committee. In the e-mail the Civic Society re-iterates its view that the proposal should not be supported. They believe that Members should not make a decision of this sensitivity until the Committee has considered the impact of this tall building on its irreplaceable and unique historic townscape and its effect on the credibility of the City's Heritage Strategy. Within the e-mail the Civic Society again sets out why they consider that the proposal does not accord with planning policy and that the Officer's Report makes no reference to the Heritage Strategy.

(iii) Comments from the Heritage and Urban Design Manager

City Centre Urban Design Guide

The City Centre Urban Design Guide (CCUDG) is guidance only and has no adopted status.

The site is at the eastern extremity of the city centre core zone. The text within the CCUDG states heights of buildings in this area will be mainly determined by their immediate context. It is not expected that heights will exceed 5 residential storeys over an active ground floor.

However, the text goes on to say that 'part of the character of Nottingham is the variety of heights. The massing rules therefore allow for occasions where a landmark feature exceeds these heights'.

Tall buildings in this strategy include any building that exceeds the predominant building heights. All buildings that do this should be subject to a tall building assessment based on views and vistas described in the design guide. Provided that the results of this assessment are acceptable, it is possible that modest tall buildings 3-4 storeys above the predominant height could be acceptable across the city centre provided that they are designed as landmarks.

Therefore I would suggest that the Civic Society's comment that the taller element of the proposal is in the wrong place is not necessarily the case. The taller element of the proposal is a landmark building as recommended in the CCUDG. The guide suggests that buildings 3-4 storeys above 6 storeys (the predominant height), giving a total height of 10 storeys, could be acceptable subject to the effect on views and vistas. It's the interpretation of the views and vistas that are crucial to the acceptability of the scheme. Clearly there are opposing opinions in the analysis between Council officers and the Civic Society in this regard. The East side of the city is less sensitive and can accommodate higher buildings as pointed out by the Civic Society. However, this does not rule out well designed taller buildings elsewhere in the city.

The Civic Society's comment regarding the application site not falling within the Tall Building Zone is correct. Clearly the Lace Market Cliff is far more sensitive than the East part of the city. However, as stated above this does not preclude well designed taller buildings within this part of the city, providing that they satisfy detailed analysis and criteria laid out in the design guide.

The text within the CCUDG also states that the rules do not override consideration of a building's context, especially in conservation areas and schemes affecting the settings of listed buildings.

The site is not within a conservation area, the nearest being the Lace Market CA to the north running along the base of the cliff. The document states that: Any development below the cliff will effect views of the Lace Market and must have regard to the unique and prominent nature of the site. New buildings should be of a scale and massing that complements the character and does not screen or reduce the impact of the cliff or the key visual features. Buildings should normally be simple in form. They should have well balanced red brick elevations with a regular rhythm of vertically proportioned windows. Large developments will need to be visually broken down to reflect the informality of the view.

The proposal has been broken down to reflect the castellated cliff development, has verticality and rhythm and is constructed primarily from brick.

The Heritage Strategy

Within the introduction of the strategy it states that the city's heritage is a force in regeneration and that promoting an active role for heritage in regeneration and development is key to securing investment and releasing the potential held within the historic fabric of the city.

The three headings within the strategy are:

Understand the contribution that the historic environment makes to the city

Capitalise on the existing and potential roles that heritage brings to the city

Celebrate the city's rich past, promoting Nottingham as a distinctive place to live and visit

In terms of interpreting the three headings, again it is about the contribution the new development makes to its immediate context and the city as a whole. A great deal of analysis has been undertaken as to the contribution the proposal will make to the townscape of this part of the city, including its impact upon cliff, which is outlined in the officer's report and reflects the key headings and aspirations outlined above within the Heritage Strategy.

Finally, the immediate environment to the south of the site is generally poor in terms of the traffic dominated streets and quality of buildings. The proposed tower is of an appropriate scale in relation to the size of the space; its location would add to the drama of the cliff and help frame this unique city centre asset. When viewed along London Road it creates a point of arrival at the city centre edge and would be a distinctive modern addition to this part of the city.

(iv) Comments from Ward Councillor Edwards

As ward Councillor I was briefed on the proposed development and by that time, the proposal had already taken on key messages of seeking to make the development rise from west to east whilst buildings on the escarpment behind already rise from east to west.

The development had also already taken on the idea of taking inspiration from the architecture of the Lace Market - brick with contrasting stone tiers, high windows, rounded corners. There is a lot of detail and decoration. And roof gardens.

A key consideration for me is the view when people first see the city centre as they pass over the London Road railway corridor. I have therefore asked at previous meetings about drama and decoration, and think the tower is nicely shaped from that point of view from the south, contrasting well against the not-so-old development behind it.

Workers at Loxley House will know the light in the sunset can often be very dramatic across the flat valley that includes the Narrowmarsh, the canal and the railway corridor. A metallic decoration across the western wall of the tower has the potential to be very dramatic.

I might prefer a lower tower, or a tower with some tapering, but have taken on board points made about financial viability.

I have accompanied a resident from a flat behind the development (who is concerned about loss of light and loss of views) to meet a planning officer, and understand those concerns have been recorded but not accepted as sufficiently valid objections in planning terms.

It will be interesting to see if a retail unit can be viable on the site; Broadmarsh shopping centre, with discounting stores, is not far away. However, it will be convenient for local residents and those walking to and from events at the Ice Arena, Meadow Lane, Trent Bridge and the City Ground.

I would have been minded to support the scheme because it develops a difficult site, provides housing for which I think there will be a demand, significant effort has been made to take inspiration from architectural styles of the Lace Market and I think the tower will be an attractive feature as northbound travellers pass over the London Road railway bridge.

I don't believe the development will detract from views of St. Marys.

(v) Amendment to condition 2

The condition shall read:-

The development shall not be commenced until details of the external materials to be used in the development, including details (at a scale of 1:20) of the proposed windows (with reveal depths), doors, balconies, roof plant/furniture and roof edges, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development is satisfactory and in the interests of visual amenity to accord with Policy 10 of the Aligned Core Strategy.

Comments:

- 1. Members are requested to note that the proposal has been refined as part of the pre-application process.**
- 2. The Committee Report explains how the scheme has been assessed against the relevant planning policies. The Heritage and Urban Design Manager comments make specific regard to the Heritage Strategy.**
- 3. Noted.**
- 4. Noted.**
- 5. Required to ensure that design quality is maintained.**

(Additional background papers:

1. Notes from Design Review Panel 10.12.15
2. Notes from Meeting of Chairs of DRP and Heritage Panel 16.03.16
3. Comments from the Heritage and Urban Design Manager 20.09.16
4. Comments from Cllr Edwards 16.09.16)

4d Unit 2B, Millennium Way East

Additional Information

The applicant has provided further information in relation to the likely age profile of users, also noting that this will vary from centre to centre. Climbers actually undertaking the activities could be split as Under 16s - 80%, Adults - 20%. However, the applicant advises that the split of all people visiting the site is more likely to be Under 16s - 60% and Adults - 40%, given that the Under 16 age range will be accompanied by an adult even if the adults are not participating in the main activities.

The applicant has also advised that they are happy to review safe access to the site with Highways and will operate the premises in accordance with all statutory regulations.

Comments:

That the applicant's further information is considered.

(Additional background papers:
Agent's emails 15.09.16 & 21.09.16)

4e QMC – Elevated walkway linking tram stop to QMC

1. Access Officer: Support this suggested design approach which will provide a greatly improved main entrance access arrangement for all potential pedestrian visitors to the QMC.

2. Tree Officer: No objections subject to conditions relating to the submission of an Arboricultural Method Statement and replacement trees (conditions 4, 5 and 7 of draft decision notice).

3. NET Team: Discussions are ongoing between the Nottingham University NHS Trust, NET team and Tramlink Nottingham regarding the walkway. All parties are supportive of the proposal, as a direct link into the hospital would improve accessibility for tram users. Further consideration of the following matters will be required:

- (i) The circulation of people at the tower platform;
- (ii) Proposed way finding signage to direct non-tram users and access arrangements for people at ground level;
- (iii) Clarification on whether it is the intention that the link bridge is used by the hospital as a point of egress in emergency situations;
- (iv) The link bridge should be wide enough to allow wheelchair and mobility scooter users to pass one another;
- (v) Details of security/CCTV and lighting proposals for the link bridge;
- (vi) The nearest supporting structure to the tram needs to avoid a box culvert located to the north of the tram access tower.

Comments:

- 1. A Construction Method Statement detailing how the development works are to be carried out, including details of any construction works which may**

have an impact upon NET infrastructure or operations, has been included on the draft decision notice (condition 2).

- 2. The proposed walkway has been designed to provide access to all tram users, including wheelchair and mobility scooter users.***
- 3. Details of how the walkway will link into the tram platform, CCTV and lighting proposals are to be agreed by condition.***

(Additional background papers:

1. Email from Access Officer 14.09.16
2. Email from NET Team 13.09.16
3. Email from Tree Officer 16.09.16)

This page is intentionally left blank